

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | 1 |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|---|
| 10/723,574 | 11/26/2003 | Ba-Zhong Shen | BP3134 | 9932 | _ |
| 51472 7 | 590 06/26/2006 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| - | ARRISON & MAR | KISON | CHASE, S | HELLY A | |
| P.O. BOX 160 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | 7 |
| AUSTIN, TX | /8/10-0/2/ | | 2133 | | _ |

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Office Action Summers | 10/723,574 | SHEN ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Shelly A. Chase | 2133 | _ |
| The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply | ion appears on the cover sheet w | th the correspondence address | |
| • • | DEDLY 10 OFT TO EVENE | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ration. The period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AE | CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication IANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | • | • | |
| 1) Posponojvo to communication(a) filed o | . 26 November 2002 | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) [| This action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for | | are prospection as to the morite is | |
| closed in accordance with the practice u | | · • | ı |
| diosed in accordance with the practice t | midei Li, parte Quayle, 1955 C.b. | . 11, 433 O.G. 213. | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the ap | plication. | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w | vithdrawn from consideration. | | |
| 5) Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 24-34</u> is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12</u> is/are rejected. | | • | |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>13-23</u> is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction | and/or election requirement. | | |
| Application Papers | | • | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Ex | kaminer. | • | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 November 20 | 03 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ | objected to by the Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection | n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar | ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the | correction is required if the drawing | (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d | J). |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by | the Examiner. Note the attached | Office Action or form PTO-152. | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for | foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § | 119(a)-(d) or (f). | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority doc | uments have been received. | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority doc | | pplication No | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the | ne priority documents have been | received in this National Stage | |
| application from the International | Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action fo | r a list of the certified copies not | received. | |
| | | THE WAY | LSE SE |
| | | PRIMARY EXA | MHOET |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- | | Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date | |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC Paper No(s)/Mail Date | | nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) | |
| . apor rio(o) man batta | رة | · | |

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 to 34 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references listed in the information disclosure statement submitted on 9-30-2004, 1-5-2005 & 7-11-2005 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 12 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574 Page 3

Art Unit: 2133

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/668,526. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of USPA No. 10/668,526 contains every element of claim 12 of the instant application and as such anticipates claim 12 of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. <u>In re Longi</u>, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); <u>In re Berg</u>, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " <u>ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES</u>, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 13 to 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 1 to 11 and 24 to 34 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art made of record teaches various decoders for decoding for low density parity check (LDPC) codes using symbol nodes, check nodes, updating the symbol nodes, check nodes and the LLR values. For instance, Yu-Hu (Efficient implementations of the sum-product algorithm for decoding LDPC codes, IEEE) discloses a system for updating the check nodes and the symbol nodes using the LLR values. Chen et al. (Reduced-complexity decoding of LDPC codes, IEEE) discloses decoding the LDPC codes using the bipartite graph and LLR values according to a belief-propagation (BP).

Page 4

However, the prior art made of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach or fairly suggest or render obvious the novel element of the instant invention.

Specifically, the prior art made of record, fails to teach or fairly suggest the limitation of "during a last iterative decoding iteration, making a best estimate for the symbol using that symbol's most recent corresponding plurality of possible soft symbol estimates; and making bit estimates based on the best estimate for the symbol such that the bit estimates are hard decisions for each of the individual bits of the symbol."

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 5

examiner should be directed to Shelly A. Chase whose telephone number is 571-272-

3816. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SHELLY CHASE DOMARY EXAMINER